

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/780,300	02/17/2004	Edward K. O'Neil	ORACL-01448US1	9756	
23910 FLIESLER MI	7590 06/15/2009 FYER LLP	EXAMINER			
650 CALIFOR	NIA STREET	JACKSON, JAKIEDA R			
14TH FLOOR SAN FRANCI	SCO, CA 94108		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
orn cran co	300, 0.13 1100		2626		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/15/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/780,300	O'NEIL ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
JAKIEDA R. JACKSON	2626		

	JAKIEDA R. JACKSON	2626					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE REPLY FILED 09 June 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.					
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of thi application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) A Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.113. or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailting date of the final rejection.							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706,07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office armay reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1. tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropri- nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee te action; or (2) as				
NOTICE OF APPEAL							
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(a)), to avoid dismissal of Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).							
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>							
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); 							
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for 							
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a ∈	corresponding number of finally reig	ected claims.					
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13	21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)							
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s). 		•					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		I be entered and an e	xplanation of				
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-28 and 30-44</u> .							
Claim(s) rejected: 7-20 and 30-44. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to c showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar.	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:							
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). 13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
/David R Hudspeth/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626							

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicants have amended the claims to include subject matter that requires search under the art of 10/103. In particular, Applicants have amended the claims to include defining a data binding tag that defines a boundary for rendering the information and rules for when the information is rendered, specifying a first action by data binding tag, wehrein the first action includes reading or updating the information stored in the first data source and rendering each item in the first data source in the user interface with a markup language according to the boundary and the rules defined by the data binding tag and based at least partially the first action.

Regarding Applicant's arguments Hawley does not appear to disclose specifying using a scripting language at least one attribute on the data binding tag. Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.11(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references. Applicant's mere statement that Hawley appears that a user interface component can include multiple views of related business objects, which does not patentably distinguishes the references, rather ust restates what the the reference shows.

For these reasons, the proposed amendments will not be entered,